

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 10/633,131 08/01/2003 Alvaro Maury CS02-012 3108 12/09/2004 EXAMINER GEORGE O. SAILE RACHUBA, MAURINA T 28 DAVIS AVENUE POUGHKEEPSIE, NY 12603 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 12/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			H -(\ / \ / \
Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	100
	10/633,131	MAURY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	M Rachuba	3723	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timed within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timel the mailing date of this co D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 Se	eptember 2004.		
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims			
 4) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10-19 is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-4,9,19-22 and 27 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) 5-8 and 23-26 is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	n from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.			
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 26 April 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	***		-D 4 404(d)
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National	Stage
Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/29/03.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa	ite)-152)

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 10/633,131

Art Unit: 3723

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

- 1. Claims 10-18 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 23 September 2004.
- 2. Applicant's election with traverse of Invention II in the reply filed on 23 September 2004 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the apparatus of claims 1-9 is not independent from the apparatus of claims 10-18 and 19-27. This is not found totally persuasive because the apparatus of claims 10-18 is independent and distinct from the apparatus of claims 19-27, in that it is directed to a conditioning apparatus, while claims 1-9 and 19-27 are directed to a polishing apparatus. However, the examiner agrees that the apparatus of claims 1-9 and the method of claims 19-27 should be rejoined. Please refer to the action below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claims 2, 3, 5, 8, 9, 20, 21, 23, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 9 appears to be limiting a method of using the apparatus of claim 1, but does not further limit the apparatus. The scope of claim 9 cannot be determined. Claims 2, 3, 5, 8, 20, 21, 23 and 26 all

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 10/633,131

Art Unit: 3723

recite "said slurry emulsion". "Emulsion" is defined as **1.** A suspension of small globules of one liquid in a second liquid with which the first will not mix: *an emulsion of oil in vinegar.* This limitation lacks antecedent basis, as only a slurry has been previously claimed. Applicant has not claimed structure of method for providing the emulsion.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

¹The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Third Edition copyright © 1992 by Houghton Mifflin Company. Electronic version licensed from INSO Corporation; further reproduction and distribution restricted in accordance with the Copyright Law of the United States. All rights reserved.

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 10/633,131

Art Unit: 3723

- 7. Claims 1-4, 9 (as best understood), 19-23, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiou et al US006398627B1 in view of Kawashima US006293849B1. '627 discloses the claimed invention, including a manifold having identical nozzles, each with a check valve, but does not disclose bifurcated supply lines, each branch having an adjustable flow control valve, and a flow meter. '849, in a similar device, figure 1 and its description, teaches providing a bifurcated supply line 14, 16 to a nozzle to supply diluted slurry to a polishing pad, the bifurcated supply line having one branch from a slurry supply, and one from a dilution supply. The bifurcated lines each have a shutoff valve 26, a pressure regulator 28, and a flow valve 29. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to have provided '627 with the bifurcated supply line taught by '849, to allow controlled mixing of slurry and dilution, as taught by '849, to more accurately control the polishing properties of the device, see column 2, lines 37-54.
- 8. Applicant may overcome this rejection by amending the claims to include limitations that each individual nozzle is fed from a bifurcated supply line.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 5-8, and 23-26 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Other similar devices are cited of interest.

Application/Control Number: 10/633,131

Art Unit: 3723

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M Rachuba whose telephone number is **(571) 272-4493**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30 AM to 3:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Hail, can be reached on (571) 272-4485. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M. Rachuba Primary Patent Examiner